DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 056 635 HE 002 622

TITLE	Women Faculty in the University of Pennsylvania.
INSTITUTION	Pennsylvania Univ., Philadelphia.
PUB DATE	Mar 71
NOTE	36p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Employment Patterns; *Faculty; Feminism; *Higher Education; *Social Discrimination; Status; *Women Professors
IDENTIFIERS	*University of Pennsylvania

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this report was to explore the status of faculty women and make recommendations to remedy any inequities found. The general picture which emerges is similar to that found at other universities. There are very few women on the faculty; women are concentrated in the lowest ranks; many departments have no women faculty members; there has been little change in departmental staffing patterns in the last 5 years; there are inhibitions toward employing husband and wife teams; women faculty members earn less than men in the same rank; and women are less visible in other aspects of the academic community, such as invited speakers, artists in residence, honorary degrees awarded, committee membership and University Senate membership. These aspects are contrasted to a role for women faculty based on realistic perceptions of her talents and fair treatment. Supporting statistical data appear in separate appendices. (LR)

EDO 566635

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

WOMEN FACULTY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

Report of the Committee
on the Status of Women

March 23, 1971

Mildred Cohn, Chairman
R. Jean Brownlee
Helen Davies
Alice Emerson
Virginia Henderson
Theodore Hornberger
Robert C. Jones
Madeleine Joullie
Phoebe Leboy
Johanna Lieb
Martha Mueller

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE 002 622

Table of Contents

	Page
Purpose..	1
The National Picture	2
The Pennsylvania Profile	2
Difficulties in Gathering Data	4
Recommendation	5
Myths Relating to the Scarcity of Qualified Women	5
Progress or Stagnation?	7
Recruitment	7
Table on appointments	8
Recommendations	8
Promotion	9
Table on promotions	10
Recommendations	10
Nepotism	11
Recommendation	12
Salaries	12
Table comparing salaries of faculty men and women	13
Visibility (honors and recognition)	14
General Remarks and Further Recommendations	15
Additional Recommendation on Appointment of Women	17

Table of Contents

Page

Appendices

I. Distribution of fully-affiliated faculty, professorial ranks, by school, rank and sex..... 18

II. Distribution of fully-affiliated faculty, other ranks, by school, rank and sex..... 19

III. Distribution of fully-affiliated faculty, professorial ranks, by department, rank and sex..... 20

IV. Number of Doctorates earned by women and percent of total earned in fields of study in selected years.... 25

V. Comparison of proportion of qualified women in each discipline with the proportion found in departments at the University of Pennsylvania..... 27

A. Questionnaire sent to all department chairmen requesting information on affiliation, tenure and salary status of their faculty members..... 29

B. Questionnaire sent to all schools requesting number of men and women faculty, by rank and affiliation..... 32

C. Questionnaire sent to all schools requesting number of appointments and promotions, by sex, approved by the school personnel committee and by the Provost Staff Conference..... 33

PURPOSE

The ad hoc Committee on the Status of Women was established on May 8, 1970, by the Faculty Affairs Committee of the University Council. Among its charges were :

(1) to collect information on the representation of women in the various disciplines, both for the current year and for previous years;

(2) to solicit the views of members of the University community on possible discrimination in appointments and promotions because of sex;

(3) to study the percentage of women in academic positions by rank and discipline, and to compare it with that prevailing in comparable universities;

(4) to make recommendations to ensure an equitable representation of women on the faculty of the University of Pennsylvania.

The Committee has confined its investigation almost wholly to the problem of the status of faculty women. Other groups of women in the University community, particularly those employed in non-faculty positions and the large number of women seeking professional degrees, have a strong interest in the elimination of discrimination because of sex. The Committee has been aware of this concern, but its charges and its lack of time, staff and financing have led it to focus its attention upon the woman teacher and scholar, holder of the Ph.D. degree and entitled to equal opportunity for employment in fair competition, equal compensation with men for the same work and equal honor and respect.

The National Picture

The Committee has worked with full awareness of the charges of discrimination lodged with the Department of Health, Education and Welfare by the Women's Equity Action League against, according to the Saturday Review for March 20, 1971, "245 institutions, including the entire university systems of New York City, New York State and California." "In general," the same source affirms, "the higher the professional rank and the greater the institutional prestige, the greater the likelihood of discrimination against women. At large prestigious universities, the percentage of women faculty members averages less than 10 percent, while at small four-year and two-year colleges, women comprise up to 40 percent of the faculty. Nationwide, including all kinds of institutions, women comprise only 8 percent of the full professors, 15 percent of the associate professors and 19 percent of the assistant professors."

A 1963 study by the United States Office of Education estimated that 11 percent of the full-time faculty in large universities were women. The corresponding estimate for the University of Pennsylvania in 1970, arrived at by laborious efforts to identify fully-affiliated individuals, is 12 percent. Data produced in a recent study at the University of Chicago showed that women constituted 6 percent of the regular teaching faculty in the professorial ranks, compared to 7 percent at Pennsylvania. However, Chicago has no School of Nursing and it is not clear whether or not that study distinguished between fully- and partially-affiliated faculty. In general, however, it seems certain that our situation conforms to a national pattern for large, private universities.

The Pennsylvania Profile

The general picture which emerges from the data detailed below is a familiar one resembling other universities. In particular,

(1) there are very few women on the faculty of the University of Pennsylvania: only 7 percent of the fully-affiliated faculty at the professorial level are women. For the College, the single largest school,* the figure is only 5.7 percent.

* Excluding the School of Medicine which is larger because of its clinical faculty.

(2) women are concentrated in the lowest ranks and represent 2.5 percent of the full professors, 7.0 percent of the associate professors and 12.7 percent of the assistant professors. Again, the trend is more striking in the College: full professors include 164 men and 0 women; associate professors,64 men and 3 women; and assistant professors,101 men and 17 women.

(3) there are 14 academic departments with zero women members which should have on the average more than two on the basis of the percentage of women Ph.D's available.

The distribution of women faculty by school should also be remarked. Women constitute a distinct majority of the faculty at the professorial ranks in the Schools of Allied Medical Professions and Nursing. They represent more than 20 percent of the faculty in the Graduate School of Education and in the School of Social Work. In all other schools women comprise less than 10 percent of the faculty, with no women at all in the Annenberg School and in the four Schools of Engineering. To phrase it in another way, more than one-third of the female faculty are found in four schools: SAMP, Nursing, Education and Social Work. The faculty of these four schools comprise only 6 percent of the total University faculty at the professorial ranks.

To ascertain the current number of fully-affiliated men and women in the various academic ranks in each department of the University, the Committee distributed two questionnaires. One was sent to all department chairmen, the other to all schools with teaching faculties.

The results are presented in Appendices I, II and III. Appendix I lists the number of faculty in the professorial ranks by sex, rank and school. Appendix II gives the number of fully-affiliated faculty members in other ranks. Departmental enumerations for the professorial ranks are given in Appendix III. The enumeration involves all academic departments within the University except the clinical departments of the School of Medicine. Because of the special and numerous problems of the affiliation and salary status of individuals in these departments, we propose to consider them separately although an initial enumeration appears as an Addendum to Appendix III. A special subcommittee has been appointed to study partial affiliation in the School of Medicine and a separate report will be made later in the semester.

Statistics in Appendix I indicate that of the 77 women enumerated, 14 percent are full professors,* while 60 percent are assistant professors. Correspondingly, 43 percent of the men are full professors and 31 percent are assistant professors. Furthermore, as seen in Appendix II, women are relatively more conspicuous in the ranks below assistant

* In addition to the 11 full professors tabulated in Appendix I, there are two in the clinical departments of Medicine: one in Pediatrics and one in Psychiatry (with a joint appointment in Sociology).

professor than in those above: they constitute 27 percent of the lecturers, 42 percent of the instructors and 41 percent of those in other ranks (mainly associates and research associates).

Further information on the concentration of women faculty can be drawn from Appendix III. Among 72 departments of the University (counting as one department each SAMP, Annenberg, Education, Law, Nursing, Social Work and the four Schools of Engineering), 43 have no women faculty at the professorial ranks, 15 have one woman at the professorial rank and 14 have two or more women faculty members at the professorial ranks. In addition to the concentration of women already noted in SAMP, Nursing, Education and Social Work, a significant concentration of women also appears in the Department of English at the assistant professor level.

Difficulties in Gathering Data

Inadequate record-keeping in various parts of the University limited the scope of this study. While our data may be the most accurate presently available, we are under no illusion that it is absolutely correct. Where the same information was obtained from different sources, numerous discrepancies were noted. For example, the information on distribution of the faculty by rank within a department could usually be compared with records from school and University administrative offices, and attempts were made to correct all errors which could be detected. However, data on salaries and length of time at rank could not be confirmed and the accuracy of this information must remain in doubt.

Numerous difficulties were also encountered in attempting to calculate the number of Ph.D's awarded, by sex, in a year. The Graduate Groups provided us with one set of figures and the Registrar with another grossly different tally. Three conflicting figures were given us on the number of graduate students. Because of inaccurate data and difficulty in crosschecking replies, no study of graduate students appears in this report.

Many schools keep no records on the number of graduate student applicants they have in a year; some do not make any breakdown as to sex. Many departments do not keep extensive faculty work records. Some are unable to complete salary data because of complicated budget arrangements which change from year to year. Many departments do not keep complete records on the number of faculty considered for appointment and promotion and the results of such consideration. Extensive data on termination of appointments were apparently unobtainable. It is essential that the University give attention to maintaining accurate records.

We recommend that the administration publish annually for each department, by sex, the number of a) faculty at each rank, b) graduate students enrolled and c) Ph.D's and Doctorates granted.

Myths Relating to the Scarcity of Qualified Women

Among the explanations for the scarcity of women in the higher ranks of the faculties of leading universities, three are especially common:

(1) There is a lack of qualified women candidates for positions requiring scholarly distinction;

(2) Women are less productive in scholarship and research, as measured by the number of articles or books published as sole or senior author (a doubtful measurement since quality is more important than quantity, but almost the only one available); and

(3) Women Ph.D's do not continue in their careers.

Each of these mythical concepts has no basis in fact.

The basic source of a faculty is the pool of individuals who have earned doctorates in the United States. Government statistics are reliable on this matter. In the years between 1930 and 1968 women earned 11 percent of the doctoral degrees conferred. The scarcity of females in the senior ranks is not due, therefore, to relatively fewer female Ph.D's in the generation now retiring. Throughout most of this period there was a downward trend in the proportion of female doctorates, with a reversal of that trend occurring in more recent years. Women earned between 13 and 15 percent of the doctorates conferred in the years 1930-1939 and between 12 and 19 percent of those conferred in the 1940's, the peak coming during the war years. The proportion dropped to as low as 9 percent during the 1950's and had increased to 12 percent by the late 1960's.

A breakdown , by discipline, of the number of Ph.D's awarded each year to men and women is available from information compiled by the U.S. Office of Education. A table of such data for the years 1957-58 and 1967-68, given in Appendix IV, casts considerable doubt on the theory that there is a scarcity of women Ph.D's. Using the information from Appendix IV as an estimate of the proportion of qualified women in each discipline, a comparison has been made with the proportion of faculty women found in departments at the University (Appendix V). This

comparison is not meant to suggest that a quota system be imposed; however, it does demonstrate that the great majority of departments deviate downward from the expected figure. The possibility that chance alone would produce the observable differences is less than one in one thousand.

The earning of a Ph.D. degree does not in itself, of course, indicate suitability or availability for appointment to the faculty of the University of Pennsylvania, but one may question whether the factors bearing on suitability or availability differ substantially because of sex. It has been stated that child-bearing and child-rearing reduce the usefulness of women Ph.D's. Published census data, however, indicate that labor force participation rates for women tend to increase as the level of education rises and, further, that the number of children born per 1,000 women noticeably decreases with higher levels of education. Census data do not isolate women with doctorates (the highest educational level being five or more years of college) but several recent surveys have focused on employment rates among women doctorates.* The evidence that we have seen has consistently shown high rates of employment among women doctorates, in the vicinity of 90 percent if both full-time and part-time employed are counted.

That women scholars are less productive than men is so widely believed that even an activist sociologist such as Alice Rossi assumes it to be true.** However, a recent study of women who received their doctorates between 1958 and 1963,+ cited frequently because of its high

* For example, Simon, Clark and Galway, "The Woman Ph.D.: A Recent Profile," Social Problems, 15 (Fall, 1967), 221-236. Also, Folger, Astin and Bayer, Human Resources in Higher Education, Russell Sage Foundation, Basic Books (New York, 1970).

In the latter work, Chapter Nine reports on the results of a 1965 survey, conducted by the Commission on Human Resources, of almost 2,000 women who earned the doctorate in the period 1957-58. The Commission achieved a high rate of response and conducted follow-up surveys on initial nonrespondents. After accounting for the latter group, the corrected estimate of the proportion of women Ph.D's in the labor force was 90 percent. Further, 79 percent of the women had never interrupted their careers.

** A.S. Rossi as cited in Hearings before the Special Subcommittee on Education, Discrimination Against Women, Part II (1970), p. 923.

+ Simon, Clark and Galway, op. cit.

rate of response, found no difference in productivity, measured by the criterion of publication, between men and women.

The same study dealt with the proportion of women who continue in their careers. It was found that more than 96 percent of unmarried women Ph.D's (50 percent of the total) and 87 percent of married women without children (15 percent of the total) worked full time, while 3.5 percent worked part time. Even among married women with children (35 percent of the total), 59 percent worked full time and 25 percent worked part time.

The Committee's conclusions are that the Office of Education statistics (Appendix IV) are trustworthy and that a pool of qualified women teachers and scholars exists. That it has not been drawn upon efficiently, especially by the larger universities, seems quite evident.

Progress or Stagnation?

The Committee has not seen any published census of the University faculty, classified by sex, for periods beyond two years past. Some information bearing on the question of change in personnel was obtained, however, from the questionnaire sent to department chairmen. They were asked whether the ratio of male to female staff differs now from what it was five and ten years ago. With 61 departments providing usable responses to the question,40 reported no change from five years ago, 14 reported relatively more women and 7 indicated that there had been an increase in men. Similar responses were given to the question about the situation ten years ago.

Recruitment

The University of Pennsylvania should take vigorous measures to use the talents of the women it and its sister universities have provided with advanced and expensive education. The University can better itself intellectually by innovative steps in recruitment of its faculty.

Evidence based on data from school personnel committee and Provost Staff Conference actions over the past five years indicates

that discrimination against women, when it exists, has occurred at the departmental level.

Appointments	Men	Women	Men and Women	% Women
Total Number	881	55	936	5.9
Approved by PCAP	691	46	737	6.2
Approved by PSC	702	45	747	6.0

Approximately 80 percent of the men and 82 percent of the women considered for appointment were approved.

No statistics can reveal the private prejudices of departmental search committees or department chairmen. The number of women at faculty ranks, however, suggests either that women are not being recommended through current procedures in numbers proportional to the Ph.D. pools or that women candidates tend to be passed over in favor of men.

The responsibility of the University of Pennsylvania with respect to appointment of women faculty is twofold: (1) to insure that no discrimination on the basis of sex occurs in any faculty appointment and (2) to make every effort to increase the representation of women at all faculty ranks in order to avoid perpetuation of past inequities, strengthen the professional aspirations of our women students and improve the quality of education for the entire University community. The Committee therefore welcomes President Meyerson's innovative procedures* to ensure the consideration of women on an equal basis with men for appointments at all levels and in all schools.

The Committee makes the following recommendations:

(1) That in the case of each faculty appointment, the best qualified candidate should be chosen. The same scholarly and professional standards should be applied to men and women. Because of the inequitable ratio of men to women on the faculty, not changed significantly in the last decade, we feel that if a man and a woman are equally qualified, the woman should at this juncture be chosen. This policy is to be reviewed in not more than five years to establish whether or not an inequitable ratio still persists.

* Report of the Assembly on University Goals and Governance, American Academy of Arts and Sciences, January, 1971.

(2) That all vacancies, at the level of Assistant Professor and above, should be publicized by advertisements in appropriate professional journals. This advertising should be carried out by the procedures which are presently standard for British and Canadian universities.

(3) That the desired qualifications for any vacant faculty position be specified at the time the vacancy is advertised.

(4) That written records of all applications and supplementary material received from an applicant, whether successful or unsuccessful, be kept for five years after vacancy is filled.

(5) That a University-wide committee (of A-2 personnel) be appointed by the President from a panel submitted by the Steering Committee of the University Council. This committee should be responsible for ensuring compliance with anti-discrimination procedures and should have the power to initiate review of appointments as well as have free access to departmental records pertaining to appointments. It should have among its members a significant proportion of women. This committee may publish the results of its findings and can make recommendations to the President.

Promotion

The under-representation of women in the higher faculty ranks led to examination of promotion, average times elapsed between taking the professional degree and promotion (or appointment) to associate professor and full professor, and the machinery of personnel decisions on the school and University levels. So few women were involved that meaningful comparisons were difficult.

Promotions	Men	Women	Men and Women	% Women
Total Number	1,115	101	1, 216	8.3
Approved by PCAP	655	61	716	8.5
Approved by PSC	659	59	718	8.2

Approximately 59 percent of the men and 58 percent of the women considered for promotion were approved.

In this area, as in that of initial appointment, discrimination at the departmental decision level is suggested.

The Committee therefore recommends:

(1) That, in addition to the stated University policies, each department make available in written form specific information regarding its criteria for promotion.

(2) That personnel committees of each department and school have women represented during consideration of promotions and terminations. If no women are eligible within a school or its equivalent, women from related disciplines should be invited to participate as non-voting members.

(3) That the personnel committee of each school be instructed to review not only the qualifications of persons proposed for promotion but also the records of those for whom termination of employment is proposed. Such records should be reviewed at least fourteen months prior to termination.

(4) That the University-wide committee with power to initiate review of appointments serve also as a review committee to ensure compliance with anti-discrimination procedures in promotions.

(5) That because of the inequitable ratio of men to women on the faculty, we feel that if a man and a woman are equally qualified, the woman should at this juncture be promoted. This policy is to be reviewed in not more than five years to establish whether or not an inequitable ratio still persists.

The Issue of Nepotism

"Would there be any barrier to a husband and wife working in your department?" was one of the questions asked of department chairmen. An unqualified "No" was returned by 38; the response from 20 was "Yes"; and 5 replies were conditional. The explanations of those who felt that there would be a barrier included (1) a belief that the University absolutely prohibits, or actively discourages, such appointments; (2) an opinion that such appointments pose administrative difficulties, particularly with regard to salary decisions, department voting and personnel management; and (3) a reaction to a poor prior history of such appointments.

The current University policy, as set forth in the Handbook for Faculty and Administration (p. 36), does not prohibit but rather "permits the employment of more than one member of a family when the members are appointed because of their recognized capabilities or qualifications." The policy statement, however, indicates situations in which the University "in general discourages" such employment, as when the situation "might imply that a second member of a family is employed only because of his or her relationship to the first."

Nine department chairmen responded "Yes" also to the question of whether there would be any barrier to a husband and wife working within the University; 26 responded "No" while the remaining chairmen answered conditionally, replied that they did not know or did not respond to the question.

While the numbers have not been fully confirmed, it would appear that there are some 17 married couples employed within departments of the University, apart from the clinical departments of the School of Medicine. Because of the confidential nature of our data, the specific ranks of each member of the husband and wife pairs have been identified in only eight instances. In four of them, the male is fully-affiliated and in the professorial ranks while the female is partially-affiliated, usually in the non-professional ranks; with two couples both members are fully-affiliated at the professorial ranks; two couples have both members partially-affiliated.

The Committee sees no reason not to accord full affiliation to persons whose husbands or wives are fully-affiliated and full-time members of the faculty, provided that the competence of such persons is established under competitive conditions.

It is essential that clearer statements of University policy on both nepotism and partial affiliation be formulated and publicized

throughout the University. Both should be based upon the fact that marriages of persons working in the same field are not uncommon. There are also positive advantages to the University in utilizing the talents of highly competent persons likely to be, because of their companionship, unusually productive scholars.

> We recommend that all appointments be made solely on the basis of demonstrated competence in teaching and scholarship, and that a husband and wife be welcomed, even within the same department. A rule that each abstain from the discussion of the salary or promotion of the other would be sufficient protection against abuse.

Salaries

Equity in salaries for men and women doing the same work is elemental justice. A subcommittee has attempted to assess the situation through the information on fully-affiliated faculty in the professorial ranks given by department chairmen.

We recognize that the negotiation of salaries between individuals and the University involves many factors, among them the supply and demand in particular fields and the individual's professional stature. An approach to the question of equity in salaries must be concerned with the comparability of these factors in sets of men and women.

There was very real difficulty in making valid statistical studies of men and women because of the absence of matched pairs. There are few women on the faculty and many hold a unique status. In those cases where there are men holding comparable positions, most of the men have held the position for a longer period of time, making salary comparison difficult. Because length of time at a given position was expressed as an average for a group, it was impossible to discern if there were any men within a given rank who could be compared to women at that rank.

Department chairmen were asked to place the median salary of men in a given rank at the base 100. The median salary for women in the given rank if there were more than one, or the actual salary of a single woman in that rank, was then to be expressed relative to the base 100.*

* Salary information was not obtained, in most cases, from departments with no women faculty members.

Over the three professorial ranks, 31 comparisons of male and female salaries, within ranks and departments, were possible. Included in the comparisons are 56 of the women faculty members in professorial ranks, or nearly 75 percent. For the remaining women faculty members there was either no male counterpart in that department at her rank or comparative salary information was not obtained. The findings are summarized in the table below.

Relative Medians for Female Salaries
(within ranks and departments)

Female Median	Number
105 and over*	2
100 - 104.9	10**
95 - 99.9	5
90 - 94.9	4
80 - 89.9	4
70 - 70.9	6
	31

* Maximum is 112
** 6 of these are exactly 100

Thus in six of the comparisons the woman's salary (or median salary if there was more than one woman) exceeds the men's median; in six others the median salaries are equivalent; in 19 comparisons the woman's salary is below the male median. For whatever reason, these simple comparisons suggest that women faculty members tend to earn less than men in the same rank.

However, in a majority of the above comparisons the mean number of years in current rank for men exceeds that for women, a factor which could account at least partially for the findings reported above. In fact, where either sex had a positive, or favorable, salary differential, they correspondingly averaged more years in current rank than the opposite sex in 20 of the 31 comparisons. Of the remaining 11 comparisons, where the direction of the salary differential was inverse to the difference in years in rank, 7 were favorable to men and 4 favorable to women. It thus would seem that years in rank (or some similar measure of experience) could account in part for the differentials observed. But we have no basis for comment on other factors that might be involved.

Visibility

That women have infrequently gained special recognition for their academic achievements is not surprising. Given the small number of women on campus and their concentration in the lower academic ranks, it is not likely that they will appear often in positions of special recognition. Thus no woman has been named to a distinguished professorship in this University. There are only two women deans and these are in schools traditionally occupied by women: the College of Liberal Arts for Women and the School of Nursing. Of the 90 departments in the University, only three, all in the School of Allied Medical Professions, are chaired by women. There have been two graduate groups chaired by women in the past five years and two women who have directed research institutes.

Moreover, when one looks at our invited speakers, artists in residence and recipients of honorary degrees--areas which are not limited to women within our faculty--one still finds that the University accords special recognition to a very few women.

In the eight lecture series surveyed over the past five years, encompassing 240 separate events and 300 speakers, women appeared only four times. The Leon Lecture Series sponsored by the College of Arts and Sciences is of particular interest. In the past many of its lecturers have been novelists, critics, poets--practitioners of occupations in which many women are outstanding. However, as far as can be determined, only two women have been invited to speak in this series since 1960: Jean Garrigue, poetess and novelist, and Margaret Webster, actress and director. Thirty-four men have been invited to speak. In addition, women are not invited as frequently as men to participate in the Artist in Residence program and few women have been given honorary degrees: since 1960, 127 honorary degrees have been awarded, five of them to women.

Within the realm of University governance women are similarly conspicuous by their absence. In the Fall of 1970 there were no women on the personnel committees of Annenberg, the College, Dentistry, Engineering, Medicine, Veterinary Medicine and Wharton.* The absence of representation on the College personnel committee is especially significant because that body acts also for the College for Women and the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences.

A study of 345 University committees for the years 1965-1970 (school and departmental committees were not included) conducted by the Office of

* Since this survey was undertaken, the School of Medicine and the School of Veterinary Medicine have added women to their personnel committees.

the Provost indicated that of the 345 committees, only 117 of them included women faculty members (34.8%) and an additional 23 had women students. A total of 3,550 members served on all the committees with many of the same people serving on more than one. Committee membership included 199 women faculty members (5.6% of the total membership) although actually only 59 women served in the 199 positions ; 3,058 male faculty members (86%);and 280 students (7.7%).

No woman has been nominated to an office in the University Senate, although one woman two years ago sat on the Senate Advisory Committee and another is currently chairman of the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility.

General Remarks and Further Recommendations

The data which have been presented makes it clear that women are very poorly represented on the faculty and in faculty-related positions, particularly those with most prestige.

To help remedy this situation this Committee believes the following recommendations should be implemented immediately:

(1) That those responsible for nominations to important University committees, top-level administrative posts, invited lectureships, honorary degrees and artists in residence be strongly urged to include more women in their consideration.

(2) That each department chairman be charged with a re-examination of the status of women already in his department to determine whether or not deserved promotion has been overlooked.

Our long-range recommendations on recruitment were made on pages 8 and 9; on promotions, page 10; and on nepotism, page 12.

The Committee recommends that a committee be set up to investigate grievances of women faculty members from the assistant instructor rank to full professor. This committee should have the power to investigate grievances concerning partial affiliation, non-appointment, reappointment, promotion and salary. A feasible mechanism for organizing such a

grievance committee might be to order departments on the basis of the percentage of women faculty they have. Those having 10 percent or more women would form a pool from which representatives to the grievance committee would be elected. The two departments in the pool with the highest percentage of women faculty (1 and 2) and the two in the pool with the lowest percentage of women (13 and 14) would each elect two representatives of whom at least one must be a woman. Women faculty members in departments other than those four would elect one woman to represent them. Each representative would serve two years except for the first year when the representatives in departments 13 and 14 would be replaced by representatives from the next two departments in the pool having the highest percentage of women (3 and 4). After two years, representatives from departments 1 and 2 would be replaced by representatives from the next two departments in the pool having the lowest percentage of women (11 and 12). No department with less than 10 percent women would elect representatives.

We recommend the exploration of new policies which would ameliorate the difficulties encountered by women Ph.D's who are married, particularly those with children. Since 50 percent of the women Ph.D's are married and 70 percent of those have at least one child, this group is not negligible. Their chief problem is to combine a full-time position with the care of their children and home. The possibility of establishing a tenure ladder for part-time positions as well as granting maternity leaves should be explored. The existence of a child care center at the University would unquestionably make it easier for the University to recruit many qualified women who have young children. The Committee believes that the administration should implement these recommendations as soon as possible.

Additional Recommendation On Appointment of Women

The recommendations made in this report should, if followed, successfully eliminate sex discrimination. However, because of the present staggering differences in numbers between men and women on the faculty, we believe it is necessary to give specific encouragement to departments to hire women. This encouragement would no longer be necessary when the representation of women on the faculty became proportional to the available pool of women candidates.

We therefore recommend:

> That the University set aside, from that part of the budget used to replace faculty lost by attrition, a proportion specifically for the appointment of qualified women scholars. It will not be necessary, of course, for a department to use that share of the budget allocated for the appointment of women. The funds can then be made available to other departments for this purpose.

Helen Davies .
Madeleine Joullie
Phoebe Leboy
Johanna Lieb
Martha Mueller

Appendix I

Distribution of Fully-Affiliated Faculty, Professorial Ranks, By School, Rank, and Sex

School	Prof.		Assoc. Prof.		Asst. Prof.		Total		Percent Female
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	(%)
Allied Medical Professions	0	1	0	4	1	3	1	8	(68.9)
Annenberg	7	0	2	0	3	0	12	0	(0.0)
Graduate Arts and Sciences	10	0	15	1	17	1	42	2	(4.5)
College	164	0	64	3	101	17	329	20	(5.7)
Dentistry	14	0	14	1	20	3	48	4	(7.7)
Education	13	1	8	3	4	3	25	7	(21.9)
Chemical Engineering	3	0	5	0	4	0	12	0	(0.0)
Civil and Mechanical Eng.	11	0	8	0	3	0	22	0	(0.0)
Electrical Engineering	17	0	16	0	13	0	46	0	(0.0)
Metallurgy and Mtls. Science	7	0	4	0	2	0	13	0	(0.0)
Fine Arts	10	2	21	0	8	1	39	3	(7.1)
Law	21	0	6	0	2	1	29	1	(3.3)
Medicine-Preclinical Depts.	37	2	22	2	24	3	83	7	(7.8)
Nursing	0	1	0	1	1	3	1	5	(83.3)
Social Work	6	2	3	2	8	3	17	7	(29.1)
Veterinary Medicine	29	1	25	2	28	4	82	7	(7.9)
Wharton	85	1	51	1	77	4	213	6	(2.7)
Totals	434	11	264	20	316	46	1014	77	(7.0)
Percent Female, By Rank	(2.5)		(7.0)		(12.7)		(7.0)		

Appendix II

Distribution of Fully-Affiliated Faculty, Other Ranks, By School, Rank, and Sex

School	Lecturer		Instructor		Other		Total		Percent Female
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	(%)
Allied Medical Professions	0	0	0	5	0	1	0	6	(100.0)
Annenberg	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
Graduate Arts and Sciences	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	(0.0)
College	2	2	19	3	5	2	26	7	(21.2)
Dentistry	2	0	6	3	9	0	17	3	(15.0)
Education	4	3	0	0	0	1	4	4	(50.0)
Chemical Engineering	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
Civil and Mechanical Eng.	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	(0.0)
Electrical Engineering	1	0	0	0	2	0	3	0	(0.0)
Metallurgy and Mtls. Science	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
Fine Arts	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	(0.0)
Law	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
Medicine-Preclinical Depts.	0	0	5	1	14	6	19	7	(26.9)
Nursing	0	2	1	27	1	12	2	41	(95.3)
Social Work	4	3	0	0	0	0	4	3	(42.9)
Veterinary Medicine	0	0	13	0	2	4	15	4	(21.1)
Wharton	23	4	7	0	7	2	37	6	(13.9)
Totals	38	14	53	39	40	28	131	81	(38.2)
Percent Female, By Ranks	(26.9)		(42.4)		(41.2)		(38.2)		

Appendix III

Distribution of Fully-Affiliated Faculty, Professorial Ranks, By Department, Rank, and Sex

Department	Professor		Assoc. Prof.		Asst. Prof.		Total	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Allied Medical Professions	0	1	0	4	1	3	1	8
Annenberg	7	0	2	0	3	0	12	0
Graduate Arts and Sciences:								
American Civilization	2	0	2	0	4	0	8	0
Classical Archaeology	1	0	2	0	1	0	4	0
Folklore and Folklife	0	0	2	0	1	0	3	0
History and Phil. of Science	0	0	1	0	3	0	4	0
Oriental Studies	7	0	6	1	5	0	18	1
South Asia Reg. Studies	0	0	2	0	3	1	5	1
College:								
Anthropology	11	0	4	0	5	0	20	0
Astronomy	4	0	0	0	1	0	5	0
Biology	15	0	5	0	3	1	23	1
Chemistry	15	0	5	1	5	0	25	1
Classical Studies	5	0	1	0	2	0	8	0
English	20	0	6	0	15	10	41	10
Geology	1	0	1	0	2	0	4	0
German	5	0	1	0	3	0	9	0
History	7	0	9	0	7	0	23	0
History of Art	3	0	2	0	4	0	9	0

Department	Professor		Assoc. Prof.		Asst. Prof.		Total	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Linguistics	6	0	0	0	2	0	8	0
Mathematics	19	0	3	0	5	0	27	0
Music	2	0	7	0	1	0	10	0
Philosophy	4	0	0	1	8	0	12	1
Physics	19	0	10	0	17	0	46	0
Psychology	11	0	7	0	9	1	27	1
Religious Thought	3	0	3	0	2	0	8	0
Romance Languages	11	0	0	0	8	3	19	3
Slavic Languages	3	0	0	1	2	2	5	3
Dentistry:								
Biochemistry	1	0	0	1	1	0	2	1
Fixed Prosthodontics	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0
Histology	1	0	1	0	2	0	4	0
Microbiology	2	0	1	0	2	1	5	1
Occlusion	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operative Dentistry	1	0	2	0	1	1	4	1
Oral Hygiene	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Oral Medicine and Diag.	3	0	2	0	1	0	6	0
Orthodontics	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	0
Periodontics	2	0	3	0	2	0	7	0
Prosthetic Dent.	1	0	1	0	1	0	3	0
Other departments	3	0	3	0	7	0	13	0

Department	Professor		Assoc. Prof.		Asst. Prof.		Total	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Education	13	1	8	3	4	3	25	7
Chemical Engineering	3	0	5	0	4	0	12	0
Civil and Mechanical Eng.	11	0	8	0	3	0	22	0
Electrical Engineering	17	0	16	0	13	0	46	0
Metallurgy and Mtls. Science	7	0	4	0	2	0	13	0
Fine Arts:								
Architecture	2	1	4	0	1	1	7	2
City and Reg. Planning	5	1	6	0	1	0	12	1
Fine Arts	2	0	5	0	2	0	9	0
Landscape Architecture	1	0	6	0	4	0	11	0
Law	21	0	6	0	2	1	29	1
Medicine-Preclinical								
Anatomy	9	0	3	0	1	0	13	0
Biochemistry	2	0	4	0	6	0	12	0
Biophysics and Phys. Bio.	4	1	2	1	8	0	14	2
Medical Genetics	3	0	2	0	1	0	6	0
Microbiology	4	0	4	0	1	1	9	1
Pharmacology	6	0	3	1	1	0	10	1
Physiology	9	1	4	0	6	2	19	3
Nursing	0	1	0	1	1	3	1	5
Social Work	6	2	3	2	8	3	17	7

Department	Professor		Assoc. Prof.		Asst. Prof.		Total	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Veterinary Medicine:								
Animal Biology	10	1	5	2	5	1	20	4
Clinical Studies	13	0	14	0	15	2	42	2
Pathobiology	6	0	6	0	8	1	20	1
Wharton:								
Accounting	5	0	0	0	7	0	12	0
Business Law	2	0	3	0	1	0	6	0
Economics	16	0	9	0	14	0	39	0
Finance	9	1	8	0	6	1	23	2
Industry	9	0	9	0	12	0	30	0
Insurance	3	0	0	0	3	0	6	0
Marketing and Intl. Bus.	6	0	6	0	5	0	17	0
Political Science	12	0	4	1	12	3	28	4
Regional Science	3	0	3	0	4	0	10	0
Sociology	10	0	5	0	8	0	23	0
Statistics and Oper. Res.	10	0	4	0	5	0	19	0
TOTALS	434	11	264	20	316	46	1014	77

Addendum

Department	Pro-fessor		Assoc. Prof.		Asst. Prof.		Total	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Medicine-Clinical:								
Anesthesia	2	0	5	1	9	1	16	2
Community Medicine	3	0	1	0	3	2	7	2
Dermatology	5	0	0	0	3	0	8	0
Medicine	27	0	32	0	35	2	94	2
Neurology	2	0	8	0	5	1	15	1
Obstetrics and Gynecology	5	0	7	1	6	1	18	2
Ophthalmology	2	0	2	0	0	0	4	0
Orthopaedic Surgery	2	0	2	0	2	0	6	0
Otolaryngology	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pathology	13	0	5	1	10	2	28	3
Pediatrics	11	1	13	3	11	1	35	5
Physical Med. and Rehab.	1	0	2	0	2	1	5	1
Psychiatry	11	1	6	0	8	1	25	2
Radiology	8	0	3	0	9	0	20	0
Research Medicine	1	0	0	0	3	0	4	0
Surgery	22	0	7	0	13	1	42	1
Therapeutic Research	2	0	0	2	0	1	2	3
Sub-totals	117	2	93	8	119	14	329	24
Percent female	(1.7)		(7.9)		(10.5)		(6.8)	

Appendix IV

Number of Doctorates Earned by Women and Percent of Total Earned, In Fields of Study, Selected Years

Field of Study	1957-58 No. of Female Ph.D.'s	1957-58 Percent of Total Ph.D.'s	1967-68 No. of Female Ph.D.'s	1967-68 Percent of Total Ph.D.'s
American Civilization	3	19%	6	16%
Anatomy, histology	11	31	21	22
Anthropology	9	18	33	24
Architecture	0[1]	0	1[2]	12
Astronomy	4	18	9	10
Biochemistry	17	11	99	22
Biology, general	27	21	72	23
Biophysics	1	7	5	6
Business	5	5	14	3
Chemistry	49	5	139	8
Economics	5	2	35	6
Education	341	21	830	20
Engineering	6[1]	1	11[2]	*
English	53	16	260	27
Genetics	4	8	10	10
Geology	3	2	6	2
Germanic Languages	11	26	30	24
History	32	11	90	13
Latin or Classical Greek	5	23	26	29
Linguistics	8	27	20	21

Field of Study	1957-58 No. of Female Ph.D.'s	1957-58 Percent of Total Ph.D.'s	1967-68 No. of Female Ph.D.'s	1967-68 Percent of Total Ph.D.'s
Mathematics	14	7	50	6
Microbiology	23	14	52	17
Music	6	8	27	15
Pharmacology	2	5	21	11
Philosophy	5	5	27	10
Physics	9	2	26	2
Physiology	10	14	31	17
Political Science & Intl. Rel.	9	5	56	11
Psychology	84	15	286	23
Regional & Area Studies	0	0	9	13
Religion	14	5	19	5
Romance Languages	35	36	113	35
Slavic Languages	1	33	10	33
Social Work	6	50	17	22
Sociology	28	19	68	19
Statistics	1	3	2	2

* Less than .5 percent

[1] Data for 1961

[2] Data for 1967

Appendix V

Department	Total Professional Rank	Female	
		Expected*	Found
American Civilization	8	1.4	0
Anthropology	20	4.2	0
Astronomy	5	0.3	0
Biology	24	5.3	1
Chemistry	26	1.6	1
Classical Studies	8	2.1	0
Economics	39	1.6	0
Education	32	6.6	7
English	51	11.0	10
Geology	4	0.1	0
German	9	2.3	0
History	23	2.8	0
Linguistics	8	2.0	0
Mathematics	27	1.8	0
Music	10	1.2	0
Philosophy	13	1.0	1
Physics	46	0.9	0
Psychology	28	5.3	1
Religious Thought	8	0.4	0
Romance Languages	22	7.8	3
Slavic Languages	8	2.6	3

* Calculated by using percentage of Ph.D.'s awarded (average of 1957-1958 and 1967-1968 of Appendix IV) multiplied by total in each department.

Department	Total Professional Rank	Female	
		Expected	Found
Architecture	9	0.5	2
Anatomy	13	3.4	0
Biochemistry (Medical)	12	2.0	0
Microbiology (Medical)	10	1.6	1
Biophysics and Phys. Bio.	16	1.0	2
Pharmacology	11	0.8	1
Physiology	22	3.4	3
Social Work	24	8.7	7
Political Science	32	2.6	4
Regional Science	10	0.7	0
Sociology	23	4.4	0
Statistics and O. R.	19	0.5	0

Questionnaire A

10/9/70

Department_____

School_____

This questionnaire pertains to academic personnel (A-2 positions) in your department who have completed their final earned degree or other professional certification relevant to their discipline. All questions are to be answered for the academic year 1970-71. People holding titles with modifying adjectives, such as Research Professor or Adjunct Professor, should be included.

1. Please comment on any factors at the University of Pennsylvania which, in your opinion, have led to discrimination against women.

2. Are the criteria for promoting a man different thanfor a woman?_____If yes, how?

3. Was the ratio of male faculty members to female members different A) Five years ago?_____If yes, explain.

   B) Ten years ago?_____If yes, explain.

4. Are there any husbands and wives in your department both having faculty rank?_____If yes, how many?

5. Would there be any barrier to a husband and wife working within your department?_____Within the University?_____ If yes, explain.

6. How many people have you offered appointments to associate or full professor in the last five years? Men_____ Women_____

7. What is the average teaching load per week for a male faculty member in your department?_____

   For a female faculty member in your department?_____

8. Please state the number of fully-affiliated (FA) and partially-affiliated (PA) academic A-2 personnel in your department at the ranks listed below, the number who have tenure, and the mean number of years of your personnel in these and previous ranks at this University. Information as to salary range and median within each rank is also needed, as is the percentage of salary derived from the University budget. Please do not divulge specific salary information. Instead, set the median salary for men at each rank at the arbitrary level of 100 and describe the median and ranges for women with respect to the median for men. Unless otherwise specified, assume that salary information is based on 9 months of full time employment.

MALE FACULTY MEMBERS

		Total Number	Number Tenured	Mean No. Years at Univ.	Mean No. Years at Current Rank at Univ.	Mean No. Years at Previous Rank at Univ.	Mean No. Years since Professional Degree	Salary Range	Median Salary	Percentage of Total Salary Which Comes From Univ. Funds
Professor	FA									
	PA									
Associate Professor	FA									
	PA									
Assistant Professor	FA									
	PA									
Lecturer	FA									
	PA									
Instructor	FA									
	PA									
Associate	FA									
	PA									
Other (specify)	FA									
	PA									

FEMALE FACULTY MEMBERS

Please remember to describe the median salary and ranges for women with respect to the median for men.

		Total Number	Number Tenured	Mean No. Years at Univ.	Mean No. Years at Current Rank at Univ.	Mean No. Years at Previous Rank at Univ.	Mean No. Years Since Professional Degree	Salary Range	Median Salary	Percentage of Total Salary Which Comes From Univ. Funds
Professor	FA									
	PA									
Associate Professor	FA									
	PA									
Assistant Professor	FA									
	PA									
Lecturer	FA									
	PA									
Instructor	FA									
	PA									
Associate	FA									
	PA									
Other (specify)	FA									
	PA									

Questionnaire B

Total Number of Faculty in Your School (1970-71)

		Fully Affiliated	Partially Affiliated
Full Professor	Male		
	Female		
Associate Professor	Male		
	Female		
Assistant Professor	Male		
	Female		
Other	Male		
	Female		

School_____

Questionnaire C

Please state below the number of faculty brought to the attention of your Personnel Committee on Appointments and Promotion, the number of faculty approved by that body and the number approved by the Provost's Staff Conference. You will note that these figures are to be broken down as to appointment or promotion. Please consider only those faculty at the rank of assistant professor or above. List the number of faculty considered during the year. Do not concern yourself with the effective appointment date.

PCAP refers to the Personnel Committee on Appointments and Promotions; PSC refers to the Provost's Staff Conference.

		APPOINTMENTS			PROMOTIONS		
Year		Total No.	No. Approved PCAP	PSC	Total No.	No. Approved PCAP	PSC
1970-71	Male						
	Female						
1969-70	Male						
	Female						
1968-69	Male						
	Female						
1967-68	Male						
	Female						
1966-67	Male						
	Female						

School_____